

To: 'Mike.Bradbury@water.ca.gov'[Mike.Bradbury@water.ca.gov];
'Kenneth.Bogdan@water.ca.gov'[Kenneth.Bogdan@water.ca.gov];
'Chris.Elliott@icfi.com'[Chris.Elliott@icfi.com]; 'tolson@usbr.gov'[tolson@usbr.gov];
'mbanonis@usbr.gov'[mbanonis@usbr.gov]
Cc: Clay, Lisa H SPK[Lisa.H.Clay@usace.army.mil]; Olsen, Randy P
SPK[Randy.P.Olsen@usace.army.mil]; Maak, Eugene C SPK[Eugene.C.Maak@usace.army.mil]; Bolton,
Jane M SPK[Jane.M.Bolton@usace.army.mil]; Kukas, Gregory A
SPK[Gregory.A.Kukas@usace.army.mil]; Schlunegger, Jesse J
SPK[Jesse.J.Schlunegger@usace.army.mil]
From: Nagy, Meegan G SPK
Sent: Tue 5/12/2015 9:33:14 PM
Subject: Fw: 408 analysis for BDCP EIS

From: Nagy, Meegan G SPK
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2015 04:25 PM
To: Nagy, Meegan G SPK
Subject: 408 analysis for BDCP EIS

All,

I had 5 questions that I needed to ask Lisa Clay following our 408 meeting. Lisa and I discussed the questions and below you'll find our responses.

1. Does the hydraulic analysis need to be done for the full range of alternatives?

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA regulation at 40 CFR 1502.14(a) and (b) gives the standard for analyzing alternatives. The Corps' 404 NEPA regulation (33 CFR Part 325 Appendix B) references the CEQ regulation and doesn't give any additional information on the level of analysis required for each alternative. 40 CFR 1502.14(a) and (b) require agencies to:

“(a) Rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, and for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated.

(b) Devote substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail including the proposed action so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits.”

Based upon this requirement, we'd like you to propose how you intend to follow the NEPA regulation in light of our need for more detail hydraulic data to be presented within the EIS. (see the Southport example for the type of information that was presented for each alternative)

2. Does the level of analysis need to be the same for all alternatives?

See above

As discussed during the meeting, we'll need to see the 1/10, 1/100, 1/200, SB5, 1/500 and design event modeled to determine impacts. We're interested in changes in velocity, water surface elevation, flowage distribution, scour, sediment transport and any up/downstream impacts.

3. Does the hydraulic information need to be within the recirculated draft or can it be in the final?

It needs to be within the recirculated draft or if it will not be ready in time, you may need to develop a supplemental NEPA document for the 408

4. Is text ok within an appendix?

The detailed hydraulics report should be included as an appendix. We'd recommend an solid executive summary be included within the appendix which can be copied into the text of the EIS. There should be language that directs the reader to each section.

5. Can EO 11988 be in an appendix since it's only for the preferred alternative?

There should be a reference within the text that points the reader to the appropriate appendix. The 8 step process itself can be included within an appendix.

US Army Corps of Engineers - Sacramento District

Operations & Readiness Branch

1325 J Street (CESPK-CO-OR)

Sacramento, CA 95814-2922

Phone: 916-557-7257

Fax: 916-557-6877